



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/387,659

08/31/1999

JAMES J. FITZGIBBON

66427

2849

22242

7590

08/28/2002

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

SALATA, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2837

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/387,659

Applicant(s)

FITZGIBBON ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan Salata

Art Unit

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2837



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND
TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Paper No:21
Serial Number: 09/387659
Filing Date: August 31,1999

1. Applicant is correct in the statement of MPEP 803.03 and correct towards that of MPEP 804 II A.

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Art Unit: 2837

3. Claim 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 16-22 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,998,950. This is a double patenting rejection.

While the grammar and syntax may be different, it is not seen where a different invention is present within the claimed invention and that of '950.

15,18) Garage Door; movement control apparatus.

The instant specification and that '950 is clearly directed towards that of garage doors. Note discussion of figure 1. No other embodiments appear present.

Sending a command...of open, close or stop movement

Claims 16,20,22 of '950 state "sending a first motor control command...raising, lowering or stopping the door"

Checking to determine whether the command is being correctly performed

Claims 16,20,22 of '950 states "detecting a malfunction...movement not in accordance with the first motor control command"

Generating a signal

Claim 16 of '950 states "sending fault control signals..."

Claims 20,22 state "sending a second motor control command..."

Controlling barrier movement

Claims 16,20,22 of '950 state "motor control circuitry which responds to motor control commands...sending fault control signals to the motor control circuitry"

Art Unit: 2837

16) Stop command and checking to see if barrier has stopped

Claim 16 of '950 states "sensing door movement...after first motor control command is sent"

Claim 22 states "door should be stopped"

Page 3, lines 3-21, clearly state that the problems of the prior art are solved by sensing inappropriate door movement. The specification does not appear to provide support for other types of "detection".

17) Open barrier if not stopped

Claim 19 of '950 states "raising the door"

41. Applicant's arguments filed 1-14-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It cannot be seen where a different invention exists between the instant application and '950.

The same invention means identical subject matter MPEP 804IIA.

While some of the grammar, syntax may be different, it does not appear that a "distinct" invention is present.

Applicant states on 1-14-02 that it is the type of detection that is "different"

As stated above, page 3, lines 3-21 clearly set forth the instant invention as "solves the problems of prior art systems by rapidly sensing inappropriate door movement...".

Art Unit: 2837

Support cannot be seen in the instant specification for limitations towards other types of detection as the detection is the improvement over the prior art.

The deletion of common structural elements in the claimed invention does not further provide a patentable distinction. Clearly the detection of a malfunction in the instant invention, is the detection of rotation of the motor after a command has been sent. The instant invention and the '950 patent both determine this by rotation when none is supposed to occur or rotation in the incorrect direction. Applicant appears to state that any other type of detection would not constitute double patenting. It is not seen where any other type of detection would be present nor would applicant be entitled to any future type of detection, which may be discovered

Applicant states on 8-19-02 that it is the deletion of the term "motor" from the '950 patent that is not present in the instant invention.

The instant specification clearly states on page 1, lines 11-13 that a garage door typically includes and electric motor having an up and down winding.

No other alternatives are seen within the instant specification and the device is not seen as operational without the motor as the instant invention detects motor movement to determine a fault.

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

Art Unit: 2837

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or filed papers should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 2800 via the PTO 2800 Fax Center located at Crystal Plaza 4. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 O.G. 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2800 CP 4 Fax Center number is (703) 308-77(22 or 24).

For assistance in Patent procedure, fees or general Patent questions calls should be directed to the Patents Assistance Center (PAC) whose telephone number is 800-786-9199. Assistance is also available on the Internet at www.uspto.gov.

For requesting copies of Cited Art, Office Actions or the like, or General Problem solving, calls should be directed to the TC 2800 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-3329 or by fax at 703-306-5515.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Salata whose telephone number is (703) 308-3120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Nappi, can be reached on (703) 308-3370.

ajs

August 26, 2002


JONATHAN SALATA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2837